BAKER BOTTS LLP

1500 SAN JACINTO CENTER 98 SAN JACINTO BIVD. AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-4039 512.322.2500 FAX 512.322.2501

AUSTIN
BAKU
DALLAS
HOUSTON
LONDON
MOSCOW
NEW YORK
RIYADH
WASHINGTON

March 28, 2003

Via Overnight Delivery

Robert T. Stewart 512.322.2584 FAX 512.322.8336 bob.stewart@bakerbotts.com

Rebecca Kane
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
MC 2222A
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Re: EPA's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) Database

Dear Ms. Kane:

The Texas Industry Project (TIP)¹ provides the following comments on EPA's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) database.

I. General Data Reliability Issues

While TIP in general supports the public availability of compliance and enforcement data, it is essential that whenever such data is posted on the internet, it is correct, up to date, and easily understood. Public availability of enforcement and compliance data serves an important purpose. However, serious consequences can result where inaccurate information results in public misconceptions regarding environmental compliance. As a result, industry should have an opportunity to correct data prior to its release to the public.

- Where certain data is not entered into the Permit Compliance System (PCS) within a short time frame from its receipt, the system automatically flags the facility as in significant noncompliance. The effort required for individual regulated entities to monitor the accuracy of this data is significant, and delays in entering data that are no fault of a particular company can result in erroneous findings of significant noncompliance.
- The schedule on which data is loaded onto the database is unclear. Exactly when automatic data transfers occur should be disclosed, allowing regulated entities to review the data as quickly as possible. Ideally, automatic notification of data

¹ The Texas Industry Project is a group of approximately fifty companies with operations in Texas. TIP members include a variety of companies in the following sectors: electric utilities, petrochemicals, upstream operations, petroleum refining, forest products, semiconductor manufacturing and aeronautics.

transfers should be made to a company's primary contact person listed in the ECHO database.

- The presentation of data is difficult for facility personnel to interpret. The public will only find it more difficult to understand, possibly resulting in misinterpretations that could negatively impact companies.
- Apparently, ECHO is only "refreshed" with new data once per month. In addition, further delay is caused by the amount of time it takes to resolve a correction request. Once a correction request is resolved, the data should be immediately uploaded to the site.

II. Additional Specific Concerns

- TIP supports EPA's removal of TRI data from the ECHO database. It is not related to enforcement and therefore, does not belong in this format. For the same reasons, EPA should remove demographic data.
- Although apparently not EPA's intent, any member of the public can file a correction request. Access to the correction process should be absolutely limited to the owner or operator of the site in question.
- EPA should "flag" data fields to indicate that their accuracy is under review immediately upon receipt of a correction request.
- The search engine appears to have a limited ability to perform boolean searches, and should be updated to yield more accurate search results.
- Searches should be performed using NAICS codes rather than SIC codes. NAICS codes more accurately describe business segments.
- Assuming the intended audience is the general public, a glossary of terms should be provided.
- EPA should allow the input of a single general contact point for each company. The contact information listed is often outdated or otherwise invalid. In addition, listing multiple contact persons will result in increased costs to industry when individuals with expertise in a specific area are forced to field general inquiries outside of their knowledge.
- Dates of purchase or sale of facilities should be included.

- The presentation of data does not fairly reflect the magnitude of alleged violations. A small reporting error is presented in the same format and may be viewed in the same way by the public as a significant release.
- A more accurate and positive reflection of EPA's and industry's enforcement and compliance record could be reflected by including the opportunities for compliance at a facility. An indication of the number of compliance points would likely show that most companies are in 99+% compliance.

TIP appreciates the opportunity to comment on the EPA's ECHO database. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Robert Theward

Robert T. Stewart

cc: Steve Kilpatrick
Matt Paulson